

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figs. 5 and 6. This sheet, which includes Figs. 5 and 6, replaces the replacement sheet of July 20, 2005.

With respect to Fig. 5, the reference label “ **56a’** ” has been amended to “ **66a’** ”.

With respect to Fig. 6, the reference line associated with “ **66a’** ” has been corrected. In addition, the reference line associated with “ **54h** ” has been corrected.

No new matter has been added by the amendments to the drawings. Further, support for such amendments can be found in at least pages 6-7 of the original specification.

Attachment: Replacement sheet  
Annotated sheet showing changes

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 3, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By the above amendment, claims 1 and 9 will have been amended to enhance clarity without narrowing the scope thereof. Claims 1-11 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the Examiner objected to the drawings and asserted that the proposed reference corrections may not be accurate because Figure 5 and Figure 6 refer to controls **66a** and display **66b**, which are depicted at different elevations in Figure 5 than in Figure 6.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings. More specifically, Applicants have amended the drawings, particularly the reference line associated with reference label **66a'**. Accordingly, favorable consideration and approval of the drawings is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Figures 1-4, i.e. Applicant's Related Art, hereinafter referred to as ARA.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1-11 as being anticipated by ARA and submit that it is inappropriate at least since ARA does not disclose each and every feature, as recited in the claims.

As stated in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order for a claim to be anticipated, each and every element set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference.

In this regard, Applicant submits that ARA fails to disclose, inter alia, "...a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member is attached to a rear side of said cabinet cover body with a joint

formed by welding...”, as recited in claim 1. Further, ARA fails to disclose, inter alia, “...the aesthetic member being attached to the rear of the cabinet cover body with an adhesive agent and a joint formed by welding, wherein the joint is disposed about a peripheral edge of the aesthetic member”, as recited in claim 7. In addition, Applicant submits that ARA fails to disclose, inter alia, “...said aesthetic member is welded to the rear side of said cabinet cover body at a peripheral edge of said aesthetic member...”, as recited in claim 9. In other words, as clearly depicted in Figure 3, ARA lacks at least the above-mentioned features, as recited in the claims.

Moreover, Applicant submits that it is inappropriate for the Examiner to assert that the various attachment features (e.g., adhesive agent and welding), as recited in the claims, are “not functionally related in a new or unobvious way” (page 3 of the Office Action) without any evidence. In addition, the failure of ARA to disclose at least each and every feature, as recited in the claims, is even acknowledged by the Examiner’s admission on page 4 of the Office Action that ARA “does not state the prescribed method of attaching the member to the body”.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over ARA in view of SNIDER (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,131).

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and submits that it is inappropriate at least since ARA and SNIDER, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature, as recited in the claims.

As required by Chapter 2143.04 of M.P.E.P., in order to establish prima facie obviousness, all of the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In this regard, Applicant submits that ARA and SNIDER, taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “a peripheral edge” of the aesthetic member, as recited in the claims. That is, SNIDER fails to supply at least the deficiencies of ARA.

Accordingly, as ARA and SNIDER, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every feature, as recited in the claims, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) and §103(a) rejections together with passage of the present application to issue. Furthermore, Applicant submits that claims 2-6, 8, and 10-11 are allowable for the

Application No.: 10/717,974

Docket No.: 9988.0081

Amdt. dated March 3, 2006


Reply to Final Office Action dated October 3, 2006

combination of features recited therein, as well as for variously depending on independent claim 1, 7, or 9, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Applicant believes that the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes that calling the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 will advance prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to do so.

Dated: March 3, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  Yung Choi Ng  
**Mark R. Kresloff** 43,324  
Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant

Attachments



ANNOTATED SHEET  
10/717,974

FIG. 5




FIG. 6

